TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The *National Era* is published every Thursday, on Seventh street, opposite Odd Fellows' Hall.

Single copy - - - - $2 | Ten copies - - - - $15
Three copies - - - - 5 | Single copy six months 1
Five copies - - - - 8 | Ten copies six months 8

*Daily National Era* to be published as soon as practicable. $5.

Payment in advance is uniformly required.

*Rates of Advertising.*—Ten cents a line for the first insertion, and ten cents a line for each subsequent one.

Money to be forwarded by mail at our risk. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposite. All letters should be sent, post paid, to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, are preferred. New York notes are at less discount than New York State notes, and those less than Western notes.

All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to G. BAILEY, *Washington, D. C.*

# NATIONAL ERA

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. VIII. WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1854. NO. 388.

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

LEONARD WRAY.

A ROMANCE OF MODERN HISTORY.

*By the author of "The Chronicles of the Bastile," "The Embassay," "The Yule Log," "Philip of Luxetia," &c.*

CHAPTER VI.

*The Brethren of the Red Republic.*

It is doubtful whether the historian, writing gravely from the standpoint of posterity, as well as for the edification of his own generation, ever condescends to take account of the thousand and one minor incidents that so largely contribute to bring about the greater events he is recording. He sees only the latter, and these in the gross; and it is sufficient for his purpose that they present themselves to his mind as a whole. He does not stay to inquire what are the instrumentalities which have determined certain results, deeming it beneath the dignity of history to descend to what may be designated as the by-play of the supernumeraries who figure in the great drama of a nation's life. So few leading events and prominent personages are made to stand boldly out from his canvass, like the chief figures grouped in the foreground of a picture; but the determining causes, and the every-day life and situation of happy and unhappy circumstances which contributed to their consummation, are not frequently even established as facts to be read, think as well as read, and who may also desire to know something of the latent sources of national commotions; to become acquainted with the various phases of human nature, and the political scale in favor of a particular individual, or diverted the current of events in the direction of a particular channel.

Yet how useful the lessons that are to be gathered from an attentive examination of the every-day records, the vulgar incidents, of any period of momentous consequence to the world. How instructive to the philosopher, to trace to its remote source the mighty circumstance on which the fate of a nation, and, in the end, the

generally accredited and uncontradicted were not wholly inadmissible. He could not now allude to the affairs of Cuba, but would do so at the earliest practicable period.

Mr. Peek said he would refer Mr. Perkins to a certain speech of Mr. Soulé, bearing upon Cuba, for the proof of his designs in reference thereto.

Mr. Maurice spoke more at length. He said the address brought to the notice of the Committee, was intended for the gentlemen of the Hemmers only; and that its introduction to the House was an unnecessary act. Whether it was to be considered as manly or chivalric, or not, he would not ask; but he desired to know if it contained a word that was not in accordance with truth.

The name of Mr. Soulé were not unknown. His appointment had been regarded with surprise throughout the country, and with alarm. His conduct at Madrid also had been such as had been expected. It had proved startling and alarming to the people of this country. And, in relation to the Black Warrior, he had been peculiarly and unnecessarily insolent and insulting. He had this not from official source, though he doubted not it could there be had, but from what he had been everywhere reported and believed in this country. It had been copied from the London *Times* into the Washington *Union*.

He doubted, however, that on his return to this hall in a few days, he could establish the truth of every allegation and the soundness of every conjecture made in the address in question.

Mr. Perkins replied briefly, when

Mr. Smith, of Virginia, arose, and said that the address, apart from being designed exclusively for the constituents of the gentleman signing it, was evidently designed for general circulation; and, in proof of this, he would state that it had been published in the *National Intelligencer*, by procurement, of course. It was designed to injure the Democratic party and its acknowledged leader, the President of the United States. He approves, he declared, were no longer members of that party.

Mr. Peckham. Oh, no! oh, no! [General and loud laughter.]

Mr. Smith described the laughter as sardonic, and continued to denounce the address, declaring that it had taken up every conceivable piece of Whig and Abolition slander and scandal against the Democratic party and its chief. It was the true policy of the Democratic party to cause all impurities to slough off.

In denouncing Abolitionists in general, Mr. Smith paused, and said, there was one gentleman upon the floor of this House, whom he could not denounce—one whom he respected as a just and good man—a remarkable illustration of the delusions in error—a gentleman whom he honored, and whom he thought would receive with a warm and cordial welcome, as entitled to its respect and esteem—a man who would never violate truth, nor dignity of bearing.

[Mr. Gerrit Smith was here understood to be referred to.]

Mr. Maurice here arose, and said he felt grateful to the gentleman from Virginia for the degree of importance he had attached to the humble and feeble question—how a copy of it should be placed upon the desk of each gentleman, and he now entertained a hope it would be generally read. [Laughter.]

Mr. Smith said he regarded the address as important, as it was a type of its kind. More extended operations of the same character were talked of.

Mr. Perkins gave notice of his intention to print his remarks entire upon the subject upon which he had arisen; and at forty minutes past one o'clock the Committee rose, and the House adjourned till 8 o'clock, to-morrow.

For the National Era.

## MAYING SONG.

BY LUCY LARCOM.

May, merry May, is out of doors.
The clouds have ceased their weeping.
Those fresh Easter lilies are all stars
A thousand rays are peeping.
The treasures kept for lovely May
Are hills and fields displaying.
For those who stay
At home to-day!
Come, let us go a-Maying!

There's saxifrage upon the rock,
And cowslips in the rushes;
The yellow willow-flowers are stark
In nodding through the bushes.
Blue violets, white anemones,
With bashful winds are playing.
There's room for three
Beneath the tree—
Come, let us go a-Maying!

The apple-buds begin to blush,
The peach will bloom to-morrow;
The maples wear their reddest flush.
The orchard-birds are busy.
The brightest green that spring can spare,
Her loan with beauty paying.
The sweet-breathed air
Sings everywhere,
Come, let us go a-Maying!

Among the boughs the robins built,
Before the April showers;
The oriole now, with plumage gilt,
Goes flashing by the flowers;
The bob-o'-link for love's dear eye do'
O'er unsown fields is saying.
He's calling you;
He means me, too;
Come, let us go a-maying!

For once give over toil, and flee
To pleasure's beckoning;
For better hearts than our eyes can see—
The harvest of a May-day.
The scent of forest-blossoms fair,
Among our pathways thronging staying,
Will stifle care,
Oh, come! let's go a-Maying!

THE INDEPENDENT DEMOCRATS OF PENNSYLVANIA.

We have already referred to the proceedings of the State Convention of Independent Democrats, which assembled at Pittsburgh, on the 24th. The policy of uniting with the Whigs in the coming election in Pennsylvania was discussed at length, but rejected by a large majority. The ground taken by the Whig Party in that State was regarded as far below the demands of Freedom, embracing no declaration of sentiments concerning the Fugitive Slave Act or Slavery within the limits of the Federal Jurisdiction. The Pittsburgh *Visiter* says:

"If the Whigs and Judge Pollock will now come out for the 'repeal of the Nebraska bill,' and as they once promised, of the Fugitive Slave bill if they will repudiate the Compromises of '50 for the sake of the last bit but one other Compromise; if they will take the ground of the Connecticut Legislature, namely, 'no more Slave States and Slave Territories'—then, in God's name, let the Free Democratic members withdraw and vote for Whigs, so pledged, if their lives indicate sound back-bones."

A resolution was offered, recommending a State Convention of citizens of all parties, to take into consideration the continued aggressions of the Slave Power, but after much discussion this was rejected.

The following resolutions were then adopted by the Convention:

"*Resolved*, That hereafter we will not be content with building the aggression of the slave power, whenever we fight to disadvantage, but will 'carry the war into Africa' itself; and will not be brought until we have exploded Slavery from all the Territories established it in the District of Columbia, prohibited the sale of human beings for the debts of their alleged masters, under Federal process, repealed the fugitive slave law, divorced the National Government from all support of Slavery, and made all connection with power to drive the iniquitous system from our country.

"*Resolved*, That the Pittsburgh Platform of Independent Democracy, adopted August 12, 1852, (except the tenth article thereof,) is a bold assertion of true Democratic doctrines, and the measures there proposed is Democracy reduced to practice, and we therefore cordially approve and will steadfastly adhere to it.

"*Resolved*, That we are in favor of dividing the State into single Senatorial and Representative districts for the State Legislature, and are opposed to all special and class legislation, and demand, instead, the passage of general laws, and that each bill be confined to one object, which shall be named in the title.

"*Resolved*, That we regard the traffic in intoxicating drink as one of the most fruitful sources of misery, pauperism, and crime, and demand its total prohibition, by a law adequate in its penalties and means of execution to accomplish that object.

"*Resolved*, That the prohibition of Slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min. was part of a compromise which never should have been made; but that compromise having been made, and the part of it favorable to Slavery having been substantially executed, it is as disgraceful to the slave interest to demand the repeal of the part favorable to Freedom, as it is in Northern doughfaces to yield to that demand, and as it will be to all Northern freemen if they acquiesce in it.

"*Resolved*, That the eleven Pennsylvania allies of Slavery in Congress, who have misrepresented the State, and sought to dishonor their constituents by the repeal of the Missouri Prohibition of Slavery, ought to receive the hearty contempt of all true Americans who believe the Declaration of Independence was adopted in good faith, and not as a rhetorical flourish; and we hereby pledge ourselves to use our utmost exertions to bring about union and harmony among the friends of all parties, for the defeat of all such men."

The Convention then adjourned *sine die*.

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1854.

KENEWALS AND NEW SUBSCRIPTIONS.—WHO RESPONDS?

The time has come when we must call upon subscribers whose terms are about expiring, to renew; and, while doing so, to send new names with their own. The first half of the present volume of the *Era* will close with the last of this month. We have just sent out a special request to our voluntary agents, to join in a determined and vigorous effort to enlarge our list. The time is auspicious. People are aroused on the subject of Slavery, and need information. Only the first great triumph of the Slave Power has been won. Further and more dangerous aggressions are meditated. The Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country needs organization. To promote the great cause of Union for the sake of Freedom, the most active efforts ought now to be made, to increase the circulation of newspapers opposed to Slavery.

The *Era* needs a special movement in its favor. Some of its best agents during the last twelve months have diverted their labors to the establishment of local Anti-Slavery papers. We do not complain of this, but could they now spare a little time to the old cause? The *Era*, which has no *local* support, and must depend alone upon the general interest felt in the vigorous maintenance of such a paper at the seat of Government? In brief terms, let us say that, should they succeed in adding to our Weekly list six thousand subscribers, it would not repay the loss we have sustained in undertaking to issue the *Daily Era*, although it would enable us to relieve ourselves from the embarrassments in which that has involved us.

Let every agent use his best exertions for the paper. Let every subscriber whose time is about to expire, renew promptly, and send us at least one new name. We reprint our Terms, and shall keep them standing, as a guide to the efforts of our friends:

TERMS OF THE NATIONAL ERA.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| One copy, 1 year, | $2 | One copy, 6 months, | $1 |
| Three copies, do., | 5 | Five copies, do., | 8 |
| Ten copies, do., | 15 | Ten copies, do., | |

Volunteer agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each new name, and 25 cents on each new semi-yearly subscriber, except in the case of clubs. Twenty-five cents is the commission on the *renewal* of an old subscriber.

A club of three subscribers (one of whom may be an old one) at $5, will entitle the person making it up to a copy of the *Era* for nine months; a club of five (two of whom may be *old* ones) at $8, to a copy for six months; a club of ten (five of whom may be *old* ones) at $15, to a copy for one year.

Money to be forwarded, by *mail, at my risk*. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit.

G. BAILEY.

*Washington, D. C.*, 1854.

WHAT A LITTLE EFFORT CAN ACCOMPLISH.

Everybody has a circle within which he or she can operate. Here is what an honest mechanic, appreciating the importance of circulating Anti-Slavery information at this crisis, did for the *Era*, a few days since, at Monmouth, Illinois:

"Sir, I know the character of your paper, it having been taken by a member of our family, Amos Chubb, of Pittsburgh, for a number of years; and as I feel it to be my duty to labor for the cause of the oppressed everywhere, I am persuaded that to extend the *Era* will promote this object. I was only last Saturday I concluded to send for it, and am making known my purpose to others that come into my shop. I thought I could form a club of ten without much effort. So, in two days, I got seven new subscribers; and I think that before the paper arrives, I can make up more than a club of ten. So you see from this feeble effort what could be done by the whole army of Free Democrats, if they *would but try*."

WENTWORTH, *May* 24, 1854.

I saw a suggestion in your paper, the *National Era*, that every subscriber should obtain one more. I like the idea, but action is the thing. I think it will be very easy for every one to do it. I am an old subscriber. I send you two more subscribers, for which I enclose you three dollars.

ANOTHER STORY BY ALICE CAREY.

We intend to commence a new story by Alice Carey, the first week in July.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM BELL SMITH will appear in next week's *Era*.

THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE has reached a circulation, counting all its issues, of 150,000. Its friends have worked hard for it.

☞ Our Philadelphia package, usually sent to our agent by Adams & Co.'s express, failed to reach him last week; consequently, our subscribers there failed to receive their papers; but we expect to be able to furnish them with the missing number this week.

☞ Some one sends us two dollars from Peacham, Vermont, but does not us give his name.

☞ To prepare the Capitol for the summer session of Congress will cost a few thousands of dollars, as we have been assured. This is a large expenditure, if that session is only to last from the first Monday in June until the first Monday in July. But the opinion is gaining here, that so early an adjournment is a thing impossible. Members, on going before their constituents, will prefer showing something more than the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, as the result of their labors during a whole session of seven months.

HORRIBLE ACCIDENT FROM CAMPHENE.—The Frankfort, Ky., *Commonwealth* states that on Monday night, May 22d, three daughters of Rev. Mr. Perry, Methodist preacher, living at El Dorado, six or seven miles from Hardensburg, were horribly burned by the explosion of a camphene lamp, and that the whole three are dead, and were buried in the same grave, on Wednesday.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?—"THE NEED OF THE TIME."

In another column the reader will find an article from a very intelligent correspondent, on the "Need of the Time." It deserves consideration. The writer would interpose no obstacle in the way of those who are seeking to bring about a general union of the friends of Freedom, but his object evidently is, to guard against an inadequate and inefficient organization of their forces.

The perpetuation of the Anti-Whig Party necessarily involves the maintenance of the present Democratic Party—and the continuance of both, leaves to Free-Soilers, or Independent Democrats, no alternative but the preservation of their organization.

The nucleus of the Independent Democratic Party was formed in 1852–'53, and was then known as the Union Democratic Party. From that time down to the last Presidential election, the most determined efforts were made to secure to the Whig Party the adhesion of its members. Its separate action was condemned as a blunder. Its leaders were charged with playing into the hands of the "Locofocos." It was asserted that the Whigs were more favorably disposed to the Cause of Freedom than the Democrats; and, therefore, to be consistent, coming quite up to the standard of the Liberty men, they had a just claim upon their support. "A half loaf was better than no bread." The true policy was "to choose between evils;" the right way was to vote for the man, most opposed to their opinions, who had a chance of beating the enemy. It was folly to throw away their votes, without the slightest prospect of success; it was wicked, by withholding them from the Whig Party, to subject it to defeat. Of course, men who plied them with arguments of this kind, held them responsible for the defeat of Henry Clay, and what was charged as necessary consequences, the annexation of Texas and the Mexican war; and responsible, too, for the election of General Pierce, and whatever consequences resulted from that event.

Steadily the friends of direct political action against the Slave Power, maintained their ground, through evil and good report, adding to their numbers, never changing their principles or policy, although, in obedience to circumstances, they accepted a new name, and in 1848 became known as the Free or Independent Democracy. They admitted frankly that in the Free States, there were more Whigs than Democrats liberally disposed towards their views, and inclined to opposition to Slavery; but, they pointed to the facts, that the Party which is in the ascendant in the Federal Government, having control of the place by alliance with the Slave Power, in obedience to that Power, is peculiarly intolerant towards Anti-Slavery movements; that, from 1836 to 1852, the Democrats were thus in the ascendant, with the exception of a few months of power under General Harrison, and a four years' term from 1848 to 1852; that the Anti-Slavery policy of the Whig Party, in the Free States, when out of power, was to be attributed largely to that necessities, which constrain an opposition to avail itself of every element of hostility to the Administration Party; that similar necessities developed similar Anti-Slavery proclivities in the Democratic Party, when it was thrown out of power and into the opposition, in 1848; and that the Whigs, *organized nationally*, and in possession of the Government from 1848 to 1852, were *practically* as pro-slavery as their predecessors—the surrender of the Wilmot Proviso, and the imposition of the Fugitive Slave Act, being the most signal achievements of the Fillmore Administration.

And they pointed to those additional facts, that, in the Whig National Convention of 1852, a majority of delegates passed resolutions in favor of the pro-slavery legislation of 1850, affirmed its finality, avowed opposition to further agitation of the Slavery question, and put in nomination a Presidential candidate who accepted emphatically the policy thus proclaimed; and that, subsequently, the Whigs generally, in their State Conventions, through their leading journals, declared acquiescence in what had been done, and manifested a strong repugnance to any kind of movement on the subject of Slavery.

We reproduce those facts, not for the purpose of reproaching any Party, not for the purpose of placing Whigs or Democrats on their defence, but for the purpose of examination or stir up anew the elements of discord, but to justify the policy of the Independent Democrats, and demonstrate to all politicians that *a union of the friends of Freedom in the free States, on the basis of either the Whig or Democratic organization, as at present existing, is utterly out of the question.* Maintain these Parties, and the same reasons which have constrained the Independent Democracy to keep up its separate organization, will force the same policy upon it. We never will assent to the compromising tactics of either, or sustain them.

The fundamental vice of both is clearly stated by our correspondent:

"Each of the other parties is divided into two wings, a pro-slavery wing and a Pro-slavery wing. The Pro-Slavery wing in each is composed of *slaveholders, who look upon Slavery as the paramount interest to be regarded in all political action, and non-slaveholders who either fear Slavery, or are careless respecting it, and therefore quite willing to do whatever the slaveholders require.* The Anti-Slavery wing of each has adopted the principle that *party unity is the primary necessity, and that, whatever obnoxious platform may be set up, whatever obnoxious candidates nominated, they are to be acquiesced in and supported, rather than hazard party division.*"

The result is before our eyes. Polk, elected by the Democratic Party, wars upon Mexico, and dismembers it, for the purpose of enlarging the area of Slavery. Fillmore, elected by the Whigs, abandons the doctrine of the glorious Ordinance of 1787, and fastens upon the country an odious act, which just now has brought a sovereign State to the brink of civil war. Pierce, chosen by the Democratic Party, repeals the Missouri Compromise, and meditates a war to prevent Emancipation in Cuba. And two years hence, a Whig President, elected on the principle clearly stated in the foregoing paragraph, would signalise his Administration by some other outrageous concession to Slavery.

No, gentlemen; if you choose to put your old parties under foot, we will put ours. Heaven knows we have no fondness for mere organization; that we care not a straw for the Independent Democratic party, if its principles and policy in regard to Slavery be adopted by the People. We go for a union of the friends of Freedom, without distinction of party; drop old names, and disregard old issues; form a real party of Freedom, with no element of compromise about it; and we are with you. But we begin right. Let us not build upon an old and a worn-out organization, but let us have done with trimming, and paltering, and tinkering, and cunning contrivances of half-way measures. The cry now is, Repeal! Repeal of what? The Nebraska and Kansas Bill? Nobody desires to see that repealed, so far as it embraces the organization of the Territories. The repeal of that section is meant by, which the Anti-Slavery restriction in the Missouri Compromise is declared null and void. We have no objection to this; indeed, it may serve as a very convenient rallying cry; but if that be all, it is hardly worth the labor of attempting a new party. There must be a principle at the bottom of the new movement, if it is to be successful. That principle must be determined by ascertaining what are our national responsibilities for Slavery. Just so far as these extend, our action must go. Slavery exists within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, is sustained there by its power, and the Slave Interest possesses and controls this Government. For this—for these things, not the slaveholders alone, not the People of the Slave States alone, but the People of all the States are responsible. Our duty is plain: it is, to turn Slavery out of the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and rescue that from the grasp of the Slave Interest. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise is but one of the many acts of the supremacy we have allowed to the Slave Power. *We must destroy that supremacy!* That alone will save this country from becoming an immense Slave Empire, dedicated to the propagation of Slavery.

Again, we say, *let us begin right.* There are three articles which contain the whole creed of the Independent Democracy on the subject of Slavery:

"That the Constitution of the United States, ordained to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty, expressly denies to the General Government all powers not therein expressly granted, and reserves to the States, or to the people, all powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States; and, therefore, the Government, having no power to make a Slave thing to make a King, and no power to make a Slave to make a Subject, the existence of Slavery, wherever it possesses constitutional power to legislate for its extinction.

"That, to the persevering and importunate demands of the Slave Power for more Slave States, new slave Territories, and the nationalization of Slavery, our distinct and unalterable answer is, no more slave States, no slave Territory, no nationalized Slavery, and no additional legislation for the extradition of slaves.

"That Slavery is a sin against God and a crime against man, which no human enactment nor usage can make right; and that Christianity, humanity, and patriotism, alike demand its abolition."

Let the Democratic Party, assembled in National Convention, adopt substantially this creed, and it becomes *the* Party of Freedom. From that moment, it will have a right to claim, and it will command, the vote of every citizen who believes that the need of the time is the abolition of the Slave Power. Let the Whig Party assemble in National Convention, take this ground, and it becomes the Party of Freedom, and would deserve, as it would receive, the vote of every sincere opponent of Slavery. But, this is not to be expected. In fact, a strong repugnance is beginning to prevail in the public mind, against the holding of any more National Conventions, to determine platforms and elect candidates. Very well—let the work be done in the Free States. Some is already begun. As we said the other day, Ohio leads the movement. The old Whig papers of that State manifest a spirit of wisdom, liberality, and patriotism.* They give up old organizations, formulas, and names. They call for a Party of the People. Laying aside all pretentions of superior policy in time past, they are willing to unite on fair terms with Democrats and Independent Democrats, in a common movement for the redemption of the country from the rule of Slavery. Of course, such Principles as we have indicated above, will be cordially sustained by such a union; and the example once fairly set, it will be emulated in other States. The leading journals in Wisconsin and Michigan are already suggesting a similar movement. Let no narrow spirit, no indifferent devotion to mere organization, interfere. We observe that in Michigan, the Detroit *Tribune* proposes a State Convention of all opponents of Slavery, to meet on the 17th of June. Just before this, although unknown as the object of that paper, the Central Committee of the Independent Democracy of Michigan had called a Mass Convention, to meet on the 22d of June. Why not make an effort for concert? Let our friends confer with those of other Parties, who are in favor of a combined movement, and let a call be agreed upon, which shall have no party aspect or bearing. Let there be no strife now for preeminence—no attempt to magnify the seal of one class of the opponents of Slavery over another.

In New York, there is a tenacity of old party prejudice, which will present a serious obstacle to union. A portion of Democrats clings to the Administration, and does not seem to entertain the idea of a change of organization or existing parties. A portion of the Whigs is just as impracticable. The Albany *Evening Journal*, in an article on the 26th ult., after some very just observations on the divisions among the People of the Free States, and the consequent ascendency of the Slaveholding Oligarchy, extinguishes completely the force of its whole article, by the following paragraph in conclusion:

"For ourselves, we believe the end of Parties to be—not, like Armies, to aggrandize one ruler and dethrone another, nor, like Churches, to uphold abstract creeds of faith—but to deal directly with the practical issues of the day and generation. And the only way we have ever found to do that, has been by *voting for men who will do it*, and by *voting for no Parties that can beat.* So far, we have not found Freedom *practically* advanced one step except by the Whig Party, with whom we have acted for years. When we find ourselves wrong, right in its principles, and more able and willing to carry them out, we will urge voters to go for it, and no one."

That is—Slavery governs this country, and is hurrying it on to ruin, because the People of the Free States, who in the aggregate constitute the great majority of voters, are divided among Whigs, Democrats, and Independent Democrats, thus frittering away all their power; and the Albany *Evening Journal* therefore insist upon the necessity of union—let us all unite, and we shall be more than a match for the Slave Interest, and shall be able to take possession of the Federal Government—but, just one word in your ear, good people—*you must all join the Whig Party, "with which we have been allied for years!"*

The *Journal* should be more reasonable and liberal. Democrats and Independent Democrats think as highly of their respective organizations, as the *Journal* does of the Whig. It has no right to ask them to do what it refuses to consent to. It is not respectful to the masses of voters, who differ from it, to require as a condition to their united action, that they should join the Whig. Let it do as its brethren have done in Ohio, proclaim its readiness to drop old names, old issues, and unite on equal terms with those who have been called, Democrats, and Independents Democrats. Then might we expect an efficient organisation of the friends of Freedom in the State of New York—then would the voice and action of that great State be potential throughout the Union.

Till the *Journal*, and other newspapers like it, manifest a willingness for an *equal* union of the opponents of Slavery, they will have to bear the responsibility of the divisions that now place the sceptre in the hands of the Slaveholding Oligarchy. This will be the more deplorable, should we not say, reprehensible, because the Anti-Slavery spirit is every where rapidly developing adverse to party principles and policy in relation to the Slave Question, as intended for by the Independent Democracy. On the 23d ult., it contained a strong editorial, from which we copy the following extract:

"We cannot read the future. We cannot predict what will be the consequences of this Bill. We only know that it is wrong. But we can see what the duty of freemen is, and we mean it shall be through no fault of ours if it is left undone.

"If the North is what it claims to be, and what we have, of late, had gratifying assurance that it will be, this *day ends the era of compromise.* With the hand of Representatives that have nobly resisted the consummation of this iniquity for its standard-bearers, it will declare that there shall be *no more new slave States. It shall there shall be no more slave Territories. That there shall be no more Northern Congressmen with Southern principles. It will take the immediate colonization of Nebraska by those who can get save it from the impending curse. It will take a solemn pledge of the men it sends to Washington, that their first and last duty there shall be one for the great Freedom. It will send no more fugitives back without a legal trial. It will sweep Slavery out of every possession, former where the General Government has jurisdiction, suppress it within fifteen States, and surround it there with triple bands of steel. It will 'establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to itself and to its posterity.'* This the United States will do, if they have retained the spirit of their founders. If not, then God help the People, for their days are numbered. Such a gigantic Confederacy of crime as it must otherwise become, never existed elsewhere, cannot exist here, and ought not to exist anywhere."

This the United States will do, "if they have retained the spirit of their founders," and if the Whig and Democratic masses, represented by such journals as the *Journal* and *Atlas* of Albany, the *Tribune* and *Post* of New York, will now forget their mutual strife, acknowledge the paramount importance of Slavery Issue, and, recognising the absolute necessity of union among the voters of the Free States, unite in a Party of Freedom, for the rescue of the Federal Government from the domination of the Slave Power. If they will not do this, then we say, too, "God help the Republic, for the days are numbered."

As a matter of fact, we know that there are Whigs and Democrats in New York ready for such a union. On the Democratic side, we point to BENJAMIN F. BUTLER and PRESTON KING—on the Whig side, to the editors of the New York *Tribune*, themselves a host. Why will not these liberal men, who see clearly the necessity of the hour, whose convictions of present duty are strengthened by recollections of ancient strife, prepare the way for such a union in New York as is now in progress in Ohio?

For ourselves, we care not who are to be the leaders, who the men of mark, who, the standard-bearers, in this great Party of Freedom; which ought to be formed, and which, we fervently hope, is in process of formation. Let it grow from the bottom upwards, let it be cradled and cut and against Slavery, let it demand all that the Constitution authorizes, and take nothing less; let it boldly proclaim its purpose to place the Federal Government on the side of Liberty, as it is now forced on the side of Slavery, and we shall not stop to inquire "who shall be greatest," or to dispute about metaphysical abstractions and subtleties.

THE CLOSING SCENE.

The enforcement of the Fugitive Act in the case of Burns, required the whole power of the Federal Government. The marines at Boston, and the United States troops at New York and at Portsmouth, N. H., were ordered to the scene of action, and took possession of the Court House and Court Square. For the time, the whole city was under the power of the standing army of the United States. Never before did she sovereignty of a State appear so insignificant, never before did the doctrine of State Rights, hypocritically magnified by the sham Democracy, appear such a mockery. The Court House was a Bastile, the city was in a state of siege for one week.

As the closing scene of the drama was about to open, on the morning of the 24, Court Square was cleared, a six-pounder from the Navy Yard was stationed to guard the main entrance of the Court House, the Federal troops were drawn up in hostile array, and, to overawe the People, the artillery detachment performed various evolutions!

Orders were then given to clear the street leading to the wharf, where was stationed a United States revenue cutter, ready to receive the unfortunate prisoner. By one o'clock, the United States troops had succeeded in opening a clear passage; and at half past two the fugitive was carried to the cutter by the Marshal and his gang of two hundred men, armed with swords and pistols, and by United States soldiers, all under cover of a nine-pounder, which commanded the length of the street!

And thus was the Fugitive Slave Act enforced.

Suppose Southern People weigh the consequences of this transaction! Is this offensive interposition of the Federal Power, within a sovereign State, a matter of light? Is this constant resort to a Standing Army, to enforce an odious Federal enactment, favorable to the stability of republican institutions? When the People of the Free States, forgetting all their divisions, shall have united, and assumed the possession of the Federal Government, and an Anti-Slavery Administration shall have command of the Army and Navy, how will they like the precedents furnished by Pro-Slavery Administrations?

Mr. Suttle has got his fugitive back, but at what cost? How many Northern People have been conciliated? How much opinion has been manufactured in favor of the Fugitive Slave Act? How much of the opposition to the Nebraska Bill, and the Slave Power which dictated it, has been disarmed? How many Conservatives have been won to the Cause of the slaveholders? Their old allies in Boston hung their heads for shame. Not a voice was heard in apology for an act, whose enforcement is felt as a disgrace and humiliation. All over the North, the indignation aroused by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, has been blown into a flame by this last demonstration.

We ask, in all earnestness, is it decent, is it safe, is it Democratic, to keep on the Statute Book, an act so revolting to the States in which it is intended specially to operate, that it is impossible to enforce it, unless at the point of the bayonet, with the whole military power of the Federal Government, amidst tumult and bloodshed? It needs no prophetic eye to foresee that, if this thing is to be continued, the Federal Government will become a stench in the nostrils of the People, and the States be driven to fall back on their extreme rights. Nothing but postponed this catastrophe, but the consciousness, on the part of the People of the free States, that they have the power, by an appeal to the ballot-box, to secure the control of the Federal Government, so that, until they have tried this, they are responsible for the unjust and oppressive exactions upon them, and have no excuse for resorting to revolutionary remedies.

* INDIANA.—The *Lafayette Courier*, *Madison Courier*, *Princeton Clarion*, *and New Albany Ledger*, (all Democratic organs,) are dissatisfied with the proceedings at the recent Democratic State Convention, in endorsing the violation of Free-plighted faith, for the benefit of a Presidential aspirant, and call upon the Democratic cotemporaries not to fail to denounce the schemes of the political tricksters at Washington.

"THE SAME LAW-BREAKING, SEDITIOUS BOSTON."

"Treason festers in Boston, and has its periodical eruptions. * * * * Boston now is the Boston it was in the last war with Great Britain; that it was when Shadrach was in jail, and the same law-breaking, seditious Boston."—*Richmond (Va.) Examiner.*

Yes—the bad habits of the Revolution still cling to Boston, which now is as much hated by the Aristocracy of Slavery as it was by the Aristocracy of England, when Lord Grenville attempted to enforce the Stamp Act, and Lord North shut up its port, on account of its seditions. The prejudices of education are not quite overcome in that "law-breaking" city. Much allowance should be made for her unfortunate training in revolutionary times, under Hancock, Otis, and Adams. They had a way of resisting authority and speaking evil of dignities, which somewhat savoured of sedition; indeed, it is safe to say that "treason" began to "fester" in Boston so far back as the year 1764, when a town meeting of its citizens protested against Grenville's scheme of taxation without representation, and recommended a combination of the Colonies in defence of their common interests. It broke out into an "eruption" the next year, when stamps prepared in Great Britain, by order of the Imperial Power, were sent to Government officials in the Colonies, to sell them. There was a great elm in Boston, which the seditious opponents of the Stamp Act styled "Liberty Tree," under which they concocted their treasonable scheme, and on whose branches they sometimes hung effigies of persons conspicuous for their Administration and Loyalty. In desperation, one day, by the seditious harangues of self-styled patriots, the Liberty men were straightway to the house of Oliver, Secretary of the Colony, stamp-distributor for Massachusetts, pulled down a small building intended for a stamp-office, and frightened the official into a resignation. The pestiferous preachers were also at work. Mayhew, a congregational minister, descended from his exalted place, to dabble in the dirty waters of politics, and preached a sermon against the Stamp Act, taking for his text, "I would they were even cut off, that trouble you!"

It is even suspected that Boston was the birthplace of that notorious order, called "Sons of Liberty," which everywhere buried itself in stirring up "sedition." Meantime, "Treason" continued to "fester," and there was another "eruption" in 1768. Certain Government officials, attempting to enforce some severe regulations of the Administration, in connection with the Stamp Act, took under cover of a company of British artillery, and a town meeting in Faneuil Hall demanded from the Governor the removal of the ship of war from the harbor.

To put down this "seditious" spirit, the Governor ordered two regiments of soldiers from Halifax and two from Ireland, but the People, getting wind of it, called a notice for a convention of delegates from all the towns in the Province, to be held in Boston in ten days, advising all persons not provided with arms to procure them at once. After this, the troops arrived, and General Gage undertook to have them "quartered" at the expense of the town people, in accordance with instructions from the Home Government. The selectmen of the town set the instructions at defiance, refusing them "lodging, bedding, firing," and the General was obliged to support them as he could. The English aristocracy hereupon was as much incensed as the *Examiner* is now, and denounced Boston as "factious and rebellious." Parliament wrote home—"Every man in England regards with horror the spirit of sovereign over America, seems to jostle himself into the throne with the King, and talks of our subjects in the Colonies."

The soldiery of the Government being stationed in the street and about Faneuil Hall, to overawe the People, they became subject to all kinds of annoyances; and at last a collision took place, in which several, in ridiculous, law-breaking" citizens were killed. Forth with the misguided People assembled in town meeting, resolved that the troops must be removed, and appointed a committee to wait upon the Governor and the General, and make known their demands. Strange to say, the reasonable terms were promptly complied with—the troops were removed.

So Treason continued to "foster," till the last great "eruption"—when fifty "seditious" persons, disguised as Mohawks, boarded the tea vessels in Boston harbor, on the evening of December 16, 1773, and in the course of two hours emptied three hundred and forty-two chests of tea into the water.

Thus, for ten years, was Boston trained to sedition and law-breaking, and what is very curious, Virginia admired the spirit so displayed by her appeals, and pledged the lives and property of its citizens to sustain her! The secret of this was—Boston was committed to the death against the exercise of arbitrary, unconstitutional power by the Administration in England. It was loyal, willing to obey just laws, but determined to maintain its rights against usurpation. This was why the Virginians of that day loved her, and stood shoulder to shoulder with her. Patrick Henry was himself as "seditious and law-breaking" as Hancock or Adams. There was no time, during that whole period, when a repeal of the unconstitutional laws of the Government, would not have allayed discontent, suppressed sedition, proved a complete remedy for Treason.

Grenville vindicated the Stamp Act, as the Government officials now vindicate the Fugitive Act. The noble Pitt denounced it, and denied its constitutionality. Grenville retorted, by charging upon the opposition of Pitt and his friends, the tumults, and violent resistance of the Americans. In the spirit of certain Pro-Slavery Senators of the day, he exclaimed—"The seditious spirit of the Colonies owes its birth to the faction in this House." What said the fearless Pitt—what were his opinions of the agitations and tumults aroused by unconstitutional and odious acts of Government?

"A charge is brought against gentlemen sitting in this House, of giving birth to sedition in America. The freedom with which they have spoken their sentiments against this unhappy act is imputed to them as a crime. [Grenville, doubtless, had his *Union*, a Court Journal, too.—*Ed. Era.*] But the imputation shall not discourage me. We are told America is obstinate—America is almost in open rebellion. Sir, *I rejoice that America has resisted.* Three millions of People so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest. The Americans have been accused of factious combinations, involving the question of their loyalty."

Mr. Giddings then took the floor, and addressed the Convention in a speech, not yet reported. He was followed by Henry Wilson, in a most fervent appeal for the union of true men against the Slave Power. We have room only for extracts from his speech.

"I wish to be understood here, to-day, in regard to our position. We are ready to act with Democrats or Whigs to carry out our principles. We will forget organizations; we will go into the rear; we will do the work; if there is a 'forlorn hope' to be led, we will lead it, and others may fill the places of honor, if they will do the work. We care not for principles, great cheering; but our principles must be engraved on their hearts, and written on their foreheads; and they must live by them forever. [Renewed cheering.]

"The first duty we owe to the country is to exterminate—to annihilate—the forty-four Northern traitors in the House of Representatives at Washington. [Enthusiastic plaudits.]

"Our next duty is to sustain these Representatives from the North who voted against this Nebraska iniquity, and who will pledge themselves to the country and the world, that it shall be repealed. [Applause.]

"Then, we mean to repeal the Fugitive Slave Bill. [Enthusiastic cheering.] We mean to represent the free States or the Union, unless he will consent to blot from the statute book of this republic an act that dishonors human nature, and disgraces the age in which we live. [Renewed applause.]

* * * * * * *

"I say to the Whig party of the free States: You have been betrayed by the leaders, the Dawsons, the Toombses, and the Jenkses of the South. Now is the hour to emancipate one million of Northern freemen, and put them on the side of Liberty and the Union, and what is their Southern allies, without treason to their principles? [☞ The Memphis, Charleston, Muledgeville, and other Southern Conventions, have all been under the control of Southern Legislatures, looking exclusively after Southern interests, and sometimes talking loudly of disunion. Of late, however, there is more talk in the South of nationality. The nation now annexes slave territory, extends the area of slavery, and catches and restores fugitives from slavery. The Yankees are a very useful people. The slaveholders cannot spare them. The Union is safe now.

* * * * * * *

"A PLAN FOR FREEDOM."—"SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY."

At the last session of the Legislature of Massachusetts, an act of incorporation was granted for an "EMIGRANT AID Co." to enable the corporators being Benjamin C. Clark, Isaac Livermore, Charles Allen, Isaac Davis, William G. Bates, Stephen C. Phillips, Charles C. Hazewell, Alexander H. Bullock, Henry Wilson, James S. Whitney, Samuel E. Sewall, Samuel C. Bowe, James Holland, Moses Kimball, James B. Eaton, Joshua Bird, Otis Clapp, Anson Burlingame, Eli Thayer, and this Rich, their associates, successors, and assigns.

The great object is, to assist emigrants to settle the Western Territories, thereby propagating Freedom and Free Labor. The capital stock is not to exceed $5,000,000, to be invested in real or personal estate, provided not more than $20,000 be invested in real estate in Massachusetts.

"Sec. 3. The capital stock of said corporation shall be divided into shares of $100 each; but no more than $4 on the share shall be assessed during the first year, and no more than $5 more on the share shall be assessed in any one year thereafter.

"Sec. 4. At all meetings of the stockholder, each stockholder shall be entitled to cast one vote for each share held by him: provided that no stockholder shall be entitled to cast more than ten votes, by virtue of shares held by himself, nor more than fifty votes by proxy."

May 10th, the Corporators met at the State House of Boston, and appointed Eli Thayer, A. H. Bullock, E. E. Hale, of Worcester, Richard Hildreth, and Otis Clapp, of Boston, a committee to prepare a plan of operations. From their report the *Tribune* copies the following extract, showing the general objects of the Association, and the mode by which they are to be attained.

* * * * * * *

"REPORT.

* * * * * * *

"The

the business of obtaining subscriptions, and to represent the subscribers in the meeting of the Society, to be held in Boston on Wednesday next. The meeting was not of a nature to warrant the publication of all the details of its proceedings, nor is it necessary. The object is already fully understood, and the meeting addressed itself to its furtherance by such measures as were thought best adapted to the purpose. When the subscriptions are all taken and carefully matured, we shall be able to give further details.

We are in receipt of additional letters, making inquiries and tendering further subscriptions. The plan is received by all with pre-eminent favor, and enlists the warmest sympathies of the friends of Freedom.

The movement is a popular movement in behalf of popular institutions. The Slaveholders and Non-Slaveholders are now brought face to face, and the struggle is, who shall possess the Territories—the owners of labor, or the laborers themselves; an Oligarchy of not more than four hundred thousand masters of slaves, or twenty millions of People whose best interests are trampled upon by Slavery. Let "the Emigrant Aid Society" be everywhere welcomed and sustained, and no time be lost in carrying out its plans.

But, let not emigrants who can help themselves, await the operation of this Association. Let them follow the example of the five hundred Germans who have already gone from Cincinnati to Kansas. That is the Territory first to settle. Secure Kansas, and Nebraska will be safe. Since we are to have a "struggle for Non-existence," let us have free-limbed, free-souled, quarters. Let the firesmen of the West, let the men of North Carolina, Kentucky, and Missouri, who have been kept down by the crushing competition of Slave Labor, pour into the Territory, and establish Free Labor institutions, so that they may sit under their own vines and their own fig-trees.

The *Tribune* says:

"It will be seen that a meeting of the stockholders is to be held on the first Wednesday of June, at Boston. Meantime, subscriptions can be made by those who will call at the office of this paper, either by letter or in person. The co-operation of the friends of the enterprise in this city is earnestly desired, and a geschäftsführer will probably be sent to town for the purpose of obtaining it. It is expected that, after the permanent organization of the company is effected, on the 7th of June, public meetings will be held in Boston and in this city, and elsewhere, to further the objects of the undertaking. The spirit which has been aroused throughout the free States by the hostility of our rulers, is such that we cannot entertain a doubt that, under proper auspices, the society in question will not only enlist the co-operation of our large capitalists, but that in every town and little flourishing towns and villages scattered throughout the free States."

### LITERARY NOTICES.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW for April, 1854. New York: Leonard & Co. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C.

The contents of this number are—Results of the Census of 1851; Manners and Fashions; Archbishop Whately, on Christianity; Criminal Legislation and Prison Discipline; Lord Campbell as a Writer of History; Schamyl, the Prophet Warrior of the Caucasus; Goethe's Da Göttes' and his Works; the Balance of Power in Europe; Contemporary Literature.

EDINBURGH REVIEW for April, 1854. Published and for sale as above.

*Contents*—Mahomism; Memoirs of Locke; History of French Protestant Refugees; Memoirs of Moore; the National Gallery Report; Recent Italian Autobiographies; the Judges on Codification; Consumption of Food in the United Kingdom.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, April, 1854. Published and for sale as above.

*Contents*—Commercial Results of a War with Russia; the Prophets of all Nations; the Quiet Heart; Chronological Curiosities; the Reform Bill of 1832 and 1854; the Blue Peter and the Eastern Question; Life in the Sahara; the Cost of the Coalition Ministry.

The reader will see from the tables presented, that these British periodicals contain many articles on profoundly interesting subjects.

☞ We lately received a fine collection of Music, from Horace Waters, No. 333 Broadway, New York, one of our most enterprising music publishers. Among the pieces, are "the Modern Belle," a favorite of the Hutchinson family, arranged for the Piano; "the Baltimore Clipper Valse," by JULLIEN; "Angel Whispers," as sung by Mrs. Bostwick; "O, I'se so wicked!" as sung by Mr. C. C. Howard; the "Tournament Gallop," &c.

For the National Era.

### THE NEBRASKA BILL—NO. 3.

MR. DOUGLAS'S LETTER TO MR. BURKE—HIS DENIAL THAT HE PROPOSES TO REVIVE AND RE-ENACT THE SLAVERY CODE.

Mr. Douglas, the ostensible author of the bill, but, if I am rightly informed, the ostensible only—the scheme having, in fact, had a Cabinet origin—addressed a letter to Burke, of Maine, during, and at the same time more discreet, than his compeer, he eschews argument, and deals only in bold assertion and angry denunciation.

He affirms that it is a malicious falsehood that he proposes to carry slavery into the Territories; that, so far from that, the bill declares, and, indeed, is a part of the scheme, that it does not touch slavery at all, legislates it neither in nor out, but proposes simply to establish in the Territories "the great fundamental principle of Democracy and free institutions, which lies at the basis of our creed," and "trusts the people with the great, sacred, fundamental right of prescribing their own institutions." He even avows that to establish slavery would be "a violation of the Constitution, and of the principle of 'far the best to leave it' upon his brow. He denounces, as "a falsifier of the *record*," and "a calumniator," an old and distinguished Democratic leader in New Hampshire, who has dared to question his political soul ought to be branded with those names, who shall dare to say—that the effect of the bill will be to "revive and re-establish slavery"; and in the little letter, which he sent to the Senate, to all such statements, the epithets, "fraud," "falsehood," "wicked and unpardonable slander."

The people of the United States, from an early period, have had laws to protect the Indians against unlicensed traders, intruders upon their lands, and to punish crimes and frauds and injuries to which they would be constantly exposed, if the intercourse of whites with them were not limited and regulated by law. I suppose that no man disputing a Territory should repeal these humane and salutary restraints, would not a flock of catiffs gather, with the instinct of vultures, and pounce upon these poor and abused people?

It is a fact, too notorious, that there exists, and always has existed, in this wide country, a numerous class of persons, the regroach of one race and the scourge of the other, who have made the Aborigines their prey, wherever they could gain access to them—plundering, murdering, brutalizing, and destroying them with out pity. These have been the representatives, *not unfrequently clothed in official robes*, by whom Christian civilization has approached the simple and unsuspecting children of nature, the once proud, happy, and, for their own safety, too hospitable proprietors of this continent. Their approach has been immediately the work of fraud by summoning to their aid the arm of force, and completing by war the plunder and ruin which they commence in peace.

I believe it to be a well-authenticated fact, that when other means of provoking a conflict have failed, they have disguised themselves as Indians, and murdered whole families of white settlers; and then, having washed the paint from their faces and the blood from their hands, have hastened to the nearest scared settlement and the nearest garrison to vengeance. A paragraph goes the rounds of the press, headed *"More Indian Atrocities,"* soon to be succeeded by a *"Terrible Chastisement,"* containing most likely a glowing account of the heroic butchery enacted, and the immortal honors won by the *very men* who largely caused, if they did not directly plot, these unutterable horrors. This is all that we hear of the war. But in due time the editor of the New Vandalia *Old Driver*, late Government schoolmaster among the Indians, announces to the world, with pre-eminent delight, that a new Administration has been brought face to face with the Indians, and the enlightened friends of the imprescriptible rights of man everywhere in particular, that the United States Government, in pursuance of the honorable Mr. Toadeater of Michigan, the honorable Mr. Rootmont of Illinois, and General Grubb of Arkansas, has purchased, and, having gulshed in the late contest with the savage, have just concluded a most advantageous treaty with the chiefs and head men of our late deadly enemies, by which the Indians have transferred to the United States a portion of their *reservation* have been surrendered to the United States.

It is a subject of unbounded rejoicing and heartfelt congratulation, that the Indians in this Territory, as no doubt it will be to all the patriotic citizens of this great country, that these *most valuable* lands are now *exclusively* theirs, and the causes of hostility thus happily removed."

Fortunately for us, the Indian does not write history, but the white man; and he, with his pen created such an utter distrust and so settled a hate, that access to his soul seems to have been long barred against us. It may well be that the desire of Christian philanthropy to do and extended most of our efforts for their improvement *lies here*, and not, *as is pretended*, in an unnatural and invincible aversion to the white man, and a refinement of hate. It will never believe that these can be uncongenial to the mind of any human being, if his confidence is secured and his affections won by the voice of experience. I once knew a dispenser of instruction and charity, who was sent by the Quakers among the New York Indians, and became so fully convinced that the whites were in the habit of attended most of our efforts for their improvement *lies here*, and not, *as is pretended*, in an unnatural and invincible aversion to the white man, and a refinement of hate. It will never believe that these can be uncongenial to the mind of any human being, if his confidence is secured and his affections won by the voice of experience. I once knew a dispenser of instruction and charity, who was sent by the Quakers among the New York Indians, and became so fully convinced that the whites were in the habit of "No," he replied, "there are six Indians in the house with her." Gerrit Smith, that noble friend of his kind, told me, many years ago, that he had employed a Methodist as one of his useful, industrious, and prosperous farmers; and he esteemed them among the honestest of men. Their word was as good as a bond.

It would be unnatural that the authors of such crimes should feel a remorse so deep and corroding that life would become a burden, and they would long to quit the light of heaven and the converse of men, to be hidden under the earth which their crimes have polluted.

Unhappily, it is far otherwise. They thrive by crime, and often glory in it. A respectable neighbor of mine, a returned Californian, gave me, within a few days ago, the following narrative: A murder and robbery was committed within the mining grounds at Shasta. The murderers were traced to an Indian village. Inquiries were made to ascertain if the guilty individuals, much less to investigate the circumstances and the provocation, if any there were. An expedition was immediately got up, and rushed to the village, and massacred indiscriminately all the men. One of the party, on his return, boasted of s8s as his share in the achievement, and that, as he was on the spot standing in the door of his cabin, he levelled his rifle, and shot him. He fell backwards, within the hut. The assassin, having reloaded his gun, advanced cautiously upon the prostrate there might be other Indians, capable of defence, concealed there. On reaching the door, he found none but the old man, and a young girl attached to his wife, and, leaning on the his rifle to the old man's head and blew out his brains, and they spattered in the girl's face.

Such brutality has been common in Texas, and in Texas, Utah, and Oregon; but the contract loss attention and excite less interest in this pious, speculating, and slave-driving, Christian community, than the annual slaughter and packing at Cincinnati.

I observe, with grief, but without much surprise, that a Senator of the United States, from Ohio, has recently boasted, in his place, that he has always treated Mr. Jefferson's law, to prevent intrusion upon Indian territory, with contempt. His words are as follows, as nearly as I can recollect:

"There was a law passed in Jefferson's time, against settling in Indian territories, and yet he and the senior Senator from Wisconsin had violated it by going into the Indian country. My father had not only gone on Indian territory, but had built forts to protect the settlements, and had often taken his gun to protect them. The people of the Territories would not be controlled by such prohibitions."

Built forts on Indian territory to protect the settlements! Why, the settlements were on Indian territory, too! Aye, and it was that, and that only, which made the forts necessary. "Had often loaded guns!" How dainty and delicate! Only loaded guns! Why, there is no there none who is capable and willing to furnish us with the volume? *Black Hawk* is gone, and enough enlighten us with this singularly interesting avowal may be the means of throwing new light and new lustre upon his history and his name.

But, as I was writing some general observations upon our relation to the Aborigines, I little expected that proof and illustration from such a source would come to my hand before the ink was dry. I refer to the avowal that such a person should go for *oppression* in general, for the violation of compact, and the trampling down of the rights of others, and for the *unmolested* possession and enjoyment of that which they *reserved*.

Instead of supporting for their pattern the barbarous Israelites, considered themselves the chosen and favored instruments of exterminating the Canaanites of the New World. They believed that the heathen were given to their inheritance. The *Cavaliers* thought all men, including the Puritans, were given for theirs. Between the piety of the one and the impiety of the other, the Indian had a hard lot to his fate. They have been ground between the upper and the nether millstone. Both have been charged with the guilt of their destruction. Both treaties; and perhaps Providence righteously designs, as the only adequate punishment, that they shall mutually scourge each other. The Puritan says to the cavalier, "I will help you to the instruction of the South by the hand of deserters. But John Quincy Adams, whom he was bound and gagged, muttered, "it will not save you from."

The Hon. Samuel Houston, probably the best living authority on the subject, is reported to have lately declared in a public address, either at Providence, Rhode Island, that in the course of his long experience and extensive observation in relation to Indian affairs, he had never known a treaty to be broken by them in the first instance. I rejoice to see such a man bearing testimony in behalf of a hunted people. I trust he will follow up this testimonial beginning. I regret that he neglected to do it in the Senate on the occasion to which I have alluded. He owes the world an atonement for his wrongs and injustice to the Creek and Seminole nations, which he has been the main instrument of inflicting upon another race.

STRIKE, BUT HEAR.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

For the National Era.

### SLAVERY, NOW EXISTING IN NEBRASKA.

A communication in another column, from Richard Mendenhall, a mission teacher residing in Kansas, shows that Slavery already exists in that Territory, carried there and fostered there by missionaries of the Methodist Church South, among whom is Mr. Johnson, who has made himself quite busy in Washington this session. The statements of Mr. Mendenhall are worthy of the most serious attention.

This Methodist Church South may be regarded as a mission association for the spread of Slavery. During the struggle in California, a year or two since, for the introduction of Slavery, its newspaper organ in that State took ground against the Anti-Slavery opposition to that movement. And, as it seems by the following paragraph in the *National Intelligencer*, the Church has at last expunged from its discipline its old article about Slavery, thus renouncing the creed of the fathers of the Church.

"The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, in session at Columbus, Georgia, on the 9th inst., struck out from the Book of Discipline all those parts which condemn the institution of Slavery. The vote on expunging is said to have been unanimous, with but a single exception. The general rule, forbidding 'the purchasing of men, women, and children, with the intention to enslave them,' and which declares that 'we, as a Church of God and under the solemn responsibility we feel for the right improvement of our talents, cannot but view the extension of the system of Slavery with deep sorrow,' is now entirely expunged, and the causes of hostility thus happily removed."

Fortunately for us, the Indian does not write history, but the white man; and he, with his pen created such an utter distrust and so settled a hate, that access to his soul seems to have been long barred against us. It may well be that the desire of Christian philanthropy to do and extended most of our efforts for their improvement *lies here*, and not, *as is pretended*, in an unnatural and invincible aversion to the white man, and a refinement of hate. It will never believe that these can be uncongenial to the mind of any human being, if his confidence is secured and his affections won by the voice of experience. I once knew a dispenser of instruction and charity, who was sent by the Quakers among the New York Indians, and became so fully convinced that the whites were in the habit of "No," he replied, "there are six Indians in the house with her." Gerrit Smith, that noble friend of his kind, told me, many years ago, that he had employed a Methodist as one of his useful, industrious, and prosperous farmers; and he esteemed them among the honestest of men. Their word was as good as a bond.

It would be unnatural that the authors of such crimes should feel a remorse so deep and corroding that life would become a burden, and they would long to quit the light of heaven and the converse of men, to be hidden under the earth which their crimes have polluted.

Unhappily, it is far otherwise. They thrive by crime, and often glory in it. A respectable neighbor of mine, a returned Californian, gave me, within a few days ago, the following narrative: A murder and robbery was committed within the mining grounds at Shasta. The murderers were traced to an Indian village. Inquiries were made to ascertain if the guilty individuals, much less to investigate the circumstances and the provocation, if any there were. An expedition was immediately got up, and rushed to the village, and massacred indiscriminately all the men. One of the party, on his return, boasted of s8s as his share in the achievement, and that, as he was on the spot standing in the door of his cabin, he levelled his rifle, and shot him. He fell backwards, within the hut. The assassin, having reloaded his gun, advanced cautiously upon the prostrate there might be other Indians, capable of defence, concealed there. On reaching the door, he found none but the old man, and a young girl attached to his wife, and, leaning on the his rifle to the old man's head and blew out his brains, and they spattered in the girl's face.

Such brutality has been common in Texas, and in Texas, Utah, and Oregon; but the contract loss attention and excite less interest in this pious, speculating, and slave-driving, Christian community, than the annual slaughter and packing at Cincinnati.

I observe, with grief, but without much surprise, that a Senator of the United States, from Ohio, has recently boasted, in his place, that he has always treated Mr. Jefferson's law, to prevent intrusion upon Indian territory, with contempt. His words are as follows, as nearly as I can recollect:

"There was a law passed in Jefferson's time, against settling in Indian territories, and yet he and the senior Senator from Wisconsin had violated it by going into the Indian country. My father had not only gone on Indian territory, but had built forts to protect the settlements, and had often taken his gun to protect them. The people of the Territories would not be controlled by such prohibitions."

Built forts on Indian territory to protect the settlements! Why, the settlements were on Indian territory, too! Aye, and it was that, and that only, which made the forts necessary. "Had often loaded guns!" How dainty and delicate! Only loaded guns! Why, there is no there none who is capable and willing to furnish us with the volume? *Black Hawk* is gone, and enough enlighten us with this singularly interesting avowal may be the means of throwing new light and new lustre upon his history and his name.

But, as I was writing some general observations upon our relation to the Aborigines, I little expected that proof and illustration from such a source would come to my hand before the ink was dry. I refer to the avowal that such a person should go for *oppression* in general, for the violation of compact, and the trampling down of the rights of others, and for the *unmolested* possession and enjoyment of that which they *reserved*.

Instead of supporting for their pattern the barbarous Israelites, considered themselves the chosen and favored instruments of exterminating the Canaanites of the New World. They believed that the heathen were given to their inheritance. The *Cavaliers* thought all men, including the Puritans, were given for theirs. Between the piety of the one and the impiety of the other, the Indian had a hard lot to his fate. They have been ground between the upper and the nether millstone. Both have been charged with the guilt of their destruction. Both treaties; and perhaps Providence righteously designs, as the only adequate punishment, that they shall mutually scourge each other. The Puritan says to the cavalier, "I will help you to the instruction of the South by the hand of deserters. But John Quincy Adams, whom he was bound and gagged, muttered, "it will not save you from."

The Hon. Samuel Houston, probably the best living authority on the subject, is reported to have lately declared in a public address, either at Providence, Rhode Island, that in the course of his long experience and extensive observation in relation to Indian affairs, he had never known a treaty to be broken by them in the first instance. I rejoice to see such a man bearing testimony in behalf of a hunted people. I trust he will follow up this testimonial beginning. I regret that he neglected to do it in the Senate on the occasion to which I have alluded. He owes the world an atonement for his wrongs and injustice to the Creek and Seminole nations, which he has been the main instrument of inflicting upon another race.

STRIKE, BUT HEAR.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

### MR. CHASE'S FINAL SPEECH AGAINST THE REPEAL OF THE MISSOURI PROHIBITION.

On the night of the passage of the bill, immediately after the rejection of the Clayton amendment, Mr. CHASE rose and said in substance what follows:

I cannot, Mr. President, permit this bill to pass, without the utterance of a few words. The rejection of the amendment upon which we have just voted is a great triumph of principle, not the less valuable because covered from its assailants by the very ruins which they have yielded so reluctantly. The bill at last concedes a full, ample, and complete recognition in these new territories of the right of immigrants from the Old World to an equal participation with the native-born in the organization and control of the Territorial Governments.

But, sir, while this principle is conceded, the great wrong of the bill still remains conspicuous and flagrant. The Senator from Virginia has emphatically declared this great wrong to be his vital principle. He tells us that the repeal of the Missouri prohibition of slavery is THE PRINCIPLE of the bill. Against that repeal, every voice uttered by every man this floor, in opposition to the bill, has been directed.

I have never controverted the right of the people of the Territories to govern themselves. The position of slavery as the law of Nebraska is nothing more nor less than a simple declaration, that every inhabitant of the Territory shall be recognised as a full man, and protected in the enjoyment of all the rights of man which man derives from God. I join with the Senator from Michigan in the assertion of the great doctrine of self-government. It is to protect these rights, that Governments are instituted among men; and it is because the prohibition of slavery fulfils the greatest object of Government, that I desire to see it upheld.

But, Mr. President, I differ widely from the honorable Senator in some important particulars. I have no doubt whatever that it is not a constitutional power of Congress to legislate for a Territory. It is needless now to inquire into the source from which that power is derived. The Senator from Michigan has referred to its existence, but at the same moment, as it seems to me, concedes it in the assertion of the right of Congress to organize Governments for the Territories. Right in the hands of any power that has distinctly and emphatically asserted here tonight. And if Congress can organize a Government and prescribe its powers, the division of a Governor and Judges, and the election of a Legislature; can define the sphere of executive, judicial, and legislative authority, and can prescribe the qualifications of electors, it is impossible to maintain that Congress cannot legislate for a Territory! There can be no higher power of legislation than that which gives existence, but at the same moment, as it seems to me, concedes it in the assertion of the right of Congress to organize Governments for the Territories. Right in the hands of any power that has distinctly and emphatically asserted here tonight. And if Congress can organize a Government and prescribe its powers, the division of a Governor and Judges, and the election of a Legislature; can define the sphere of executive, judicial, and legislative authority, and can prescribe the qualifications of electors, it is impossible to maintain that Congress cannot legislate for a Territory! There can be no higher power of legislation than that which gives existence, but at the same moment, as it seems to me, concedes the fundamental law. This greatest power necessarily includes every lesser power. When the Senator from Michigan, therefore, asserts the right of the people to organize a Government, define its departments, prescribe their powers, and determine who shall exercise the right of suffrage, he necessarily asserts a right of Congress to legislate for the Territories, quite as ample as that for which any man will contend.

The Senator asks, Can the Government of the United States own the people of the Territories? He answers, and he may well answer, No. I say, No. Everybody says, No. But why not? Not because the people have declared that the individuals of the people have inalienable rights, and these rights the Declaration of Independence declares as the gift of God to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The very first step towards self-government is the inviolable security of these rights. The highest duty of Congress in the legislation of the Territories is to furnish this security. The Senator from Michigan, I trust, will find few converts to the opinion that it is necessary to self-government that this security shall be broken up and destroyed.

For thirty-four years the Missouri prohibition has secured to the people of the whole Northwest, as a guardian angel, proclaiming to all its future inhabitants absolute security in the enjoyment of these rights. It is for the sake of this security that the prohibition is so dear to the people of the country.

I have heretofore expressed the opinion, Mr. President, that the people of the Mississippi valley, from the territory northwest of the Mississippi was parcel of a compact between the two great sections of the country. But when I have insisted upon the binding force of this compact, I have never said that I have no right to claim it, because I was no friend to the original compromise of which it formed a part. Why, sir, when that compromise was made, I was a little boy, at school. Of course, I was neither act nor part of it. But as I grew up to man's estate, and became acquainted with the great public questions of our history, I certainly saw no reason for approving the compromise. If the making of it were now an original question, I would oppose it as much as I am no friend of compromises. But, sir, the compromise was made. It was made by our fathers. They were contemporaries of the men and the Representatives of the slave States united in it. It was acquiesced in by the people of both sections of the country. For more than a third of a century the public faith rested upon this compact. These are the great facts. I disregard all mere technicalities and petty quibbles about what was and what was not in 1821. I take the plain general result of the whole, and I see in this compromise what the men of the time saw in it, and what the people of the whole country then took from it, a sacred, compact, binding upon honor and good faith, although embodied in a legislative act, and therefore repealable.

Sir, if this compact yet remained unexecuted, it might be abrogated by the parties who made it, without reproach to either. But it does not remain unexecuted. It has been completely fulfilled on the part of the free States. Their Senators in this Chamber, and their Representatives in the other Hall of Congress, consulted in the formation of Missouri and Arkansas as slave States, solely upon the ground of this compact. Nor can it be doubted that the admission of the slave States, which have come into the Union since Missouri, were accepted through its influence upon public sentiment and the legislation of the country. And now, sir, after all this has been done, and after all that could be gained under this compact, after Missouri and Arkansas have been admitted, and the remaining Territory covered by it, south of 36 deg 30 min., has been filled up by slaveholding Indian tribes, we are coolly told that this compact is nothing but an ordinary act of legislation which may be repealed without any violation of faith!

It is to be repealed to-night. The Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] has told us that the novel doctrine has been taught in this Chamber through the hearts of thousands. It may be so. But, sir, there are other thousands, and tens of thousands of freemen in the valley below, who will receive that intelligence with deep indignation. They will see in the transactions of this night, the breach and dishonor of an ancient and sacred obligation. They will see in it the destruction of a security and guarantee of Freedom, which, for thirty-four years, and by reason of its acquiescence, has been regarded as inviolable.

And, sir, for what? What does this bill give us in lieu of the prohibition of slavery in the Territories? It gives us what we hold when it gives the principle of Congressional non-intervention. That is the great merit of the bill, in the eyes of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. But he tells us, that in other respects, this bill is in advance of former Territorial acts. Now, sir, it so happens, that all the more liberal provisions of this bill, which he approves, originated with the opponents of the repeal. As the bill came from the Committee on Territories, it was an exact transcript of former acts. It was, in this way, that the first Senator who directed attention to the fact, that the Governors of these Territories were invested with an absolute veto power; that all the acts of the Territorial Legislature were subjected to the revision of Congress; and that, therefore, the bill, which professed to establish popular sovereignty, subjected every act of the People, through their Legislature, to the double veto of the appointee of the President and of Congress. In these respects, the bill has received some amendment.

But, sir, the veto power, although abridged, still remains. The legislative authority of the Territory is invested, not in a Legislature elected by the People, but in the Governor and Legislature. This bill invests the Governor with a legislative power, equal to that of one-third of the members in each branch of the Legislature. His veto, or disapproval, will arrest the passage of any act which cannot command the sanction of two-thirds of each branch, notwithstanding the veto. Add to this direct power of the veto, the influence which the patronage and location of the Governor confers, and it is easily seen that the Governor, objectionable to him, are likely to receive the legislative sanction.

Then, sir, every act of the Legislature has to pass the ordeal of the Judiciary, and must, second, for its execution, in part at least, not only upon the Governor, but upon the Secretary, the District Attorney, and the Marshal. Now, sir, in this bill, the advocates of which profess so much respect for the doctrine of self-government, the Judges are appointed, and all these officers made elective by the people. But does the bill in fact contain any such provision? Not at all. The President is to appoint the Governor, the Judges, and the Secretary, and the President is to appoint the Judges, who determine the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the Legislative acts, and he is to appoint the secretary, the District Attorney, and the Marshal, who must necessarily exercise so important an influence upon the Territorial decisions. He tells us that he does not appoint all these officers, but he may remove them all, or either of them, whenever he pleases. The whole action of the Territorial Government is thus completely subjected to Executive control. The whole achievement of the bill is to *substitute Presidential intervention for Congressional intervention*. Is this self-government?

I prefer that of Congress, to be exercised by the Representatives of the States and of the People, rather than that of a President, too likely, under the influences of party, to yield to the immense patronage of his office for the extension and perpetuation of slavery.

The next objection to the Territorial Congressional regulation of the Territories will have one result which deserves attention. The question of freedom or slavery in the Territories, in the absence of Congressional action, the principles of justice, liberty, and progress, which they have avowed.

I shall rejoice, sir, if the friends of freedom, disregarding all the bitterness under which have bitherto been suffered to divide them, shall be found willing to unite for the maintenance and defence of freedom in the Territories. The present Administration, indeed, will make the first appointments; but, the officers thus appointed are removable at pleasure, and the People, by changing the Executive, may change the whole character of the official influence over the Territories. The late distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] was, in my judgment, right in the assertion, that the Constitutions of States formed out of Territories were made in Washington. I do not fully accept this statement. But nobody can doubt that the appointing power will in all probability be vested in the President by this bill will enable him to mould the Territorial institutions according to his pleasure, and to give to them a firm and determined opposition of the people themselves.

Sir, I am opposed to this Presidential interference. It is an abuse of language to call it local self-government. It is government at a distance, and by agents irresponsible to the people. It is absolutely the reverse. I, sir, who am denounced for my determined resistance to the repeal of the Missouri prohibition—that simple guarantee of freedom—am willing to support an amendment which would have secured to the people of the Territories the absolute control of their own affairs, without Congressional or Presidential intervention. That amendment proposed that the action of the President in the organization of the Territories should be restricted to the appointment of the three commissioners, who should divide the country into convenient election precincts; notify an election of Governor, Legislature, and Congress, and members of the Legislature, to be held on a certain day; receive and count the votes and announce the result, and appoint a place and time for the meeting of the Legislature, and the communication of the Government. I do not see how it is possible that a simpler, plainer, or more certain plan of giving effect to the doctrine of self-government in the Territories could be devised. I do not see how it was possible for the professed friends of that doctrine to vote against it, without the imputation of insincerity. And yet they did vote against it, and it was rejected, and Presidential intervention was established. Under these circumstances, regarding the bill as in violation of the fundamental principle of legislation of a great security for personal freedom and individual liberty; as no bill of non-intervention, but as a bill for Presidential control of the control of the people, through their chosen representatives, the control of the President, through his official patronage, I can never consent to its passage.

I stand here, Mr. President, as an independent Senator. The Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. BELL,] in the course of his remarks, referred to my position as a Democrat. I am not intended to identify me, or if he supposes that I desire to identify myself, with that party which in his judgment has become so corrupt that whose creed is contained in the Baltimore platform of 1852, and whose Administration is now urging the repeal of the Missouri prohibition, he is greatly mistaken. I have no party associations in this country which claim to be Democratic. One is the self-styled National Democracy; the other is the Democracy constituted in the record of the former excepts the institution of slavery from the application of Democratic principles; in the creed of the latter tolerates no exceptions. The policy of the former is to subordinate the rights and interests of freedom and free labor to the demands of slavery and the slave power; the latter is to yield itself a subject to the behests wherever the General Government possesses constitutional power to do so, and to place its legitimate influence on the side of liberty, rather than on the side of slavery. The former seeks the support of the extremest advocates of slavery, as indispensable to its party triumphs; the latter seeks no support, except from those, whether citizens or States, who stand firmly and unwaveringly to follow Democratic principles whithersoever they lead, without any exceptions in favor of slavery. I am a Republican Democracy. Mr. President, is stronger, as yet, in principles than in numbers; and yet this party at the last Presidential election numbered in its ranks a majority of the electors of all the voters in the United States. There are but three Senators upon this floor who are identified with the slave States—namely, the Senator who has just taken his seat from Connecticut, [Mr. GILLETTE,] my friend from Massachusetts, [Mr. SUMNER,] and myself. It so happens that more than one-fifth, in proportion to the whole number of Senators, than that of the Independent Democratic electors in proportion to the whole number of American voters.

The doctrines which guide our action in respect to this bill may be summed up in few words. We are opposed to the extension of slavery, and the docentralization of power. The National Government, in our judgment, should cease all interference with Slavery. It should uphold it nowhere. It should establish it nowhere. Only within the slave States, and so far as the institution is beyond the reach of the constitutional power of the General Government, should slavery be permitted to exist. Within those States, slavery should be left to control, regulation, amelioration, or abolition, by State authority, according to the will of the State.

I wish I had that power of persuasive eloquence, which so graces and distinguishes the Senator from Michigan [Mr. CASS], and that I would in my turn appeal to Senators from the slave States. I would say to them: You say you wish for peace. You tell us you ask for nothing but to be let alone. We ask but the same. We do not seek to involve us, the non-slaveholders of the country, in the responsibility of upholding institutions condemned by our deepest political, moral, and religious convictions. The extension of it through the action of the General Government. Within the limits of your States, we open our eyes to your institutions as they exist. We shall rejoice if those judgments lead you in the direction of emancipation. Should it not otherwise, we shall claim no right, through the agency of the General Government, to dictate or control your action. Doing this, you can have peace. Letting us alone, you will yourselves be let alone.

I see no other road, Mr. President, to peace, than this. The religious convictions, the social sentiments, the economical opinions, of most of the non-slaveholders of the United States, and of the non-slaveholders, are widely and irreconcilably at variance in respect to slavery. It is impossible, so long as the action of the Government shall be in any way or in any degree invoked in aid of slavery, to withdraw the question from these halls. So long as slavery continues here and at the seat of the National Government, sanctioned and regulated by acts of Congress; so long as slavery is permitted in the National Territories; so long as the slave trade is allowed by law in licensed and enrolled vessels of the United States; so long as men, women, and children, are sold at auction under the process of the Federal courts; so long as fugitive slave acts remain on the statute books of National legislation; so long as the powers of the Government shall be exerted for the acquisition of additional slaveholding territory, just so long will this agitation continue, just so long will there be no peace.

Then, sir, every act of denationalizing slavery did not constrain us to oppose this bill, the principle of decentralizing power would compel us, as Independent Democrats, to withhold our support from it. The tendency of the Executive is already vastly too large. We wish to diminish it, as far as possible, by withdrawing from it the appointment of subordinate officers, so far as it can be constitutionally done, and confiding their election to the people. We oppose this bill, because it enlarges the patronage and influence of the President. We oppose it because it proposes to make the President the appointing power of the Governors, the Judges, and the Secretaries of the Territories the power to elect their own officers.

The bill is defective, whatever others may do, the Independent Democrats will go forward without faltering or wavering in the path of political duty which their honest convictions prescribe. If not in other particulars, then, at length, the utter incompatibility between the pretensions of the slave power and the just claims of freedom, and recognising the absolute necessity of subjecting the whole slaveholders of the country to demand inflexibly the complete divorce of the General Government from slavery, will refuse to vote for the legitimate influence on the side of freedom, shall manifest a disposition to unite their efforts for these objects, the Independent Democrats will be found ready to make common cause with them. If no such union of the friends of freedom shall take place, the Independent Democrats will, I trust, be found ready to co-operate earnestly and honorably with any other party which is willing to act with them for the maintenance of freedom. In all events, and under all circumstances, they will, in the Congressional principles of justice, liberty, and progress, which they have avowed.

I shall rejoice, sir, if the friends of freedom, disregarding all the bitterness under which have bitherto been suffered to divide them, shall be found willing to unite for the maintenance and defence of freedom in the Territories. The present Administration, indeed, will make the first appointments; but, the officers thus appointed are removable at pleasure, and the People, by changing the Executive, may change the whole character of the official influence over the Territories. The late distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] was, in my judgment, right in the assertion, that the Constitutions of States formed out of Territories were made in Washington. I do not fully accept this statement. But nobody can doubt that the appointing power will in all probability be vested in the President by this bill will enable him to mould the Territorial institutions according to his pleasure, and to give to them a firm and determined opposition of the people themselves.

Sir, I am opposed to this Presidential interference. It is an abuse of language to call it local self-government. It is government at a distance, and by agents irresponsible to the people. It is absolutely the reverse. I, sir, who am denounced for my determined resistance to the repeal of the Missouri prohibition—that simple guarantee of freedom—am willing to support an amendment which would have secured to the people of the Territories the absolute control of their own affairs, without Congressional or Presidential intervention. That amendment proposed that the action of the President in the organization of the Territories should be restricted to the appointment of the three commissioners, who should divide the country into convenient election precincts; notify an election of Governor, Legislature, and Congress, and members of the Legislature, to be held on a certain day; receive and count the votes and announce the result, and appoint a place and time for the meeting of the Legislature, and the communication of the Government. I do not see how it is possible that a simpler, plainer, or more certain plan of giving effect to the doctrine of self-government in the Territories could be devised. I do not see how it was possible for the professed friends of that doctrine to vote against it, without the imputation of insincerity. And yet they did vote against it, and it was rejected, and Presidential intervention was established. Under these circumstances, regarding the bill as in violation of the fundamental principle of legislation of a great security for personal freedom and individual liberty; as no bill of non-intervention, but as a bill for Presidential control of the control of the people, through their chosen representatives, the control of the President, through his official patronage, I can never consent to its passage.

I stand here, Mr. President, as an independent Senator. The Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. BELL,] in the course of his remarks, referred to my position as a Democrat. I am not intended to identify me, or if he supposes that I desire to identify myself, with that party which in his judgment has become so corrupt that whose creed is contained in the Baltimore platform of 1852, and whose Administration is now urging the repeal of the Missouri prohibition, he is greatly mistaken. I have no party associations in this country which claim to be Democratic. One is the self-styled National Democracy; the other is the Democracy constituted in the record of the former excepts the institution of slavery from the application of Democratic principles; in the creed of the latter tolerates no exceptions. The policy of the former is to subordinate the rights and interests of freedom and free labor to the demands of slavery and the slave power; the latter is to yield itself a subject to the behests wherever the General Government possesses constitutional power to do so, and to place its legitimate influence on the side of liberty, rather than on the side of slavery. The former seeks the support of the extremest advocates of slavery, as indispensable to its party triumphs; the latter seeks no support, except from those, whether citizens or States, who stand firmly and unwaveringly to follow Democratic principles whithersoever they lead, without any exceptions in favor of slavery. I am a Republican Democracy. Mr. President, is stronger, as yet, in principles than in numbers; and yet this party at the last Presidential election numbered in its ranks a majority of the electors of all the voters in the United States. There are but three Senators upon this floor who are identified with the slave States—namely, the Senator who has just taken his seat from Connecticut, [Mr. GILLETTE,] my friend from Massachusetts, [Mr. SUMNER,] and myself. It so happens that more than one-fifth, in proportion to the whole number of Senators, than that of the Independent Democratic electors in proportion to the whole number of American voters.

The doctrines which guide our action in respect to this bill may be summed up in few words. We are opposed to the extension of slavery, and the docentralization of power. The National Government, in our judgment, should cease all interference with Slavery. It should uphold it nowhere. It should establish it nowhere. Only within the slave States, and so far as the institution is beyond the reach of the constitutional power of the General Government, should slavery be permitted to exist. Within those States, slavery should be left to control, regulation, amelioration, or abolition, by State authority, according to the will of the State.

I wish I had that power of persuasive eloquence, which so graces and distinguishes the Senator from Michigan [Mr. CASS], and that I would in my turn appeal to Senators from the slave States. I would say to them: You say you wish for peace. You tell us you ask for nothing but to be let alone. We ask but the same. We do not seek to involve us, the non-slaveholders of the country, in the responsibility of upholding institutions condemned by our deepest political, moral, and religious convictions.

The extension of it through the action of the General Government. Within the limits of your States, we open our eyes to your institutions as they exist. We shall rejoice if those judgments lead you in the direction of emancipation. Should it not otherwise, we shall claim no right, through the agency of the General Government, to dictate or control your action. Doing this, you can have peace. Letting us alone, you will yourselves be let alone.

I see no other road, Mr. President, to peace, than this. The religious convictions, the social sentiments, the economical opinions, of most of the non-slaveholders of the United States, and of the non-slaveholders, are widely and irreconcilably at variance in respect to slavery. It is impossible, so long as the action of the Government shall be in any way or in any degree invoked in aid of slavery, to withdraw the question from these halls. So long as slavery continues here and at the seat of the National Government, sanctioned and regulated by acts of Congress; so long as slavery is permitted in the National Territories; so long as the slave trade is allowed by law in licensed and enrolled vessels of the United States; so long as men, women, and children, are sold at auction under the process of the Federal courts; so long as fugitive slave acts remain on the statute books of National legislation; so long as the powers of the Government shall be exerted for the acquisition of additional slaveholding territory, just so long will this agitation continue, just so long will there be no peace.

Then, sir, every act of denationalizing slavery did not constrain us to oppose this bill, the principle of decentralizing power would compel us, as Independent Democrats, to withhold our support from it. The tendency of the Executive is already vastly too large. We wish to diminish it, as far as possible, by withdrawing from it the appointment of subordinate officers, so far as it can be constitutionally done, and confiding their election to the people. We oppose this bill, because it enlarges the patronage and influence of the President. We oppose it because it proposes to make the President the appointing power of the Governors, the Judges, and the Secretaries of the Territories the power to elect their own officers.

The bill is defective, whatever others may do, the Independent Democrats will go forward without faltering or wavering in the path of political duty which their honest convictions prescribe. If not in other particulars, then, at length, the utter incompatibility between the pretensions of the slave power and the just claims of freedom, and recognising the absolute necessity of subjecting the whole slaveholders of the country to demand inflexibly the complete divorce of the General Government from slavery, will refuse to vote for the legitimate influence on the side of freedom, shall manifest a disposition to unite their efforts for these objects, the Independent Democrats will be found ready to make common cause with them. If no such union of the friends of freedom shall take place, the Independent Democrats will, I trust, be found ready to co-operate earnestly and honorably with any other party which is willing to act with them for the maintenance of freedom. In all events, and under all circumstances, they will, in the Congressional principles of justice, liberty, and progress, which they have avowed.

I shall rejoice, sir, if the friends of freedom, disregarding all the bitterness under which have bitherto been suffered to divide them, shall be found willing to unite for the maintenance and defence of freedom in the Territories. The present Administration, indeed, will make the first appointments; but, the officers thus appointed are removable at pleasure, and the People, by changing the Executive, may change the whole character of the official influence over the Territories. The late distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLAY] was, in my judgment, right in the assertion, that the Constitutions of States formed out of Territories were made in Washington. I do not fully accept this statement. But nobody can doubt that the appointing power will in all probability be vested in the President by this bill will enable him to mould the Territorial institutions according to his pleasure, and to give to them a firm and determined opposition of the people themselves.

Sir, I am opposed to this Presidential interference. It is an abuse of language to call it local self-government. It is government at a distance, and by agents irresponsible to the people. It is absolutely the reverse. I, sir, who am denounced for my determined resistance to the repeal of the Missouri prohibition—that simple guarantee of freedom—am willing to support an amendment which would have secured to the people of the Territories the absolute control of their own affairs, without Congressional or Presidential intervention. That amendment proposed that the action of the President in the organization of the Territories should be restricted to the appointment of the three commissioners, who should divide the country into convenient election precincts; notify an election of Governor, Legislature, and Congress, and members of the Legislature, to be held on a certain day; receive and count the votes and announce the result, and appoint a place and time for the meeting of the Legislature, and the communication of the Government. I do not see how it is possible that a simpler, plainer, or more certain plan of giving effect to the doctrine of self-government in the Territories could be devised. I do not see how it was possible for the professed friends of that doctrine to vote against it, without the imputation of insincerity. And yet they did vote against it, and it was rejected, and Presidential intervention was established. Under these circumstances, regarding the bill as in violation of the fundamental principle of legislation of a great security for personal freedom and individual liberty; as no bill of non-intervention, but as a bill for Presidential control of the control of the people, through their chosen representatives, the control of the President, through his official patronage, I can never consent to its passage.

I stand here, Mr. President, as an independent Senator. The Senator from Tennessee, [Mr. BELL,] in the course of his remarks, referred to my position as a Democrat. I am not intended to identify me, or if he supposes that I desire to identify myself, with that party which in his judgment has become so corrupt that whose creed is contained in the Baltimore platform of 1852, and whose Administration is now urging the repeal of the Missouri prohibition, he is greatly mistaken. I have no party associations in this country which claim to be Democratic. One is the self-styled National Democracy; the other is the Democracy constituted in the record of the former excepts the institution of slavery from the application of Democratic principles; in the creed of the latter tolerates no exceptions. The policy of the former is to subordinate the rights and interests of freedom and free labor to the demands of slavery and the slave power; the latter is to yield itself a subject to the behests wherever the General Government possesses constitutional power to do so, and to place its legitimate influence on the side of liberty, rather than on the side of slavery. The former seeks the support of the extremest advocates of slavery, as indispensable to its party triumphs; the latter seeks no support, except from those, whether citizens or States, who stand firmly and unwaveringly to follow Democratic principles whithersoever they lead, without any exceptions in favor of slavery. I am a Republican Democracy. Mr. President, is stronger, as yet, in principles than in numbers; and yet this party at the last Presidential election numbered in its ranks a majority of the electors of all the voters in the United States. There are but three Senators upon this floor who are identified with the slave States—namely, the Senator who has just taken his seat from Connecticut, [Mr. GILLETTE,] my friend from Massachusetts, [Mr. SUMNER,] and myself. It so happens that more than one-fifth, in proportion to the whole number of Senators, than that of the Independent Democratic electors in proportion to the whole number of American voters.

The doctrines which guide our action in respect to this bill may be summed up in few words. We are opposed to the extension of slavery, and the docentralization of power. The National Government, in our judgment, should cease all interference with Slavery. It should uphold it nowhere. It should establish it nowhere. Only within the slave States, and so far as the institution is beyond the reach of the constitutional power of the General Government, should slavery be permitted to exist. Within those States, slavery should be left to control, regulation, amelioration, or abolition, by State authority, according to the will of the State.

I wish I had that power of persuasive eloquence, which so graces and distinguishes the Senator from Michigan [Mr. CASS], and that I would in my turn appeal to Senators from the slave States. I would say to them: You say you wish for peace. You tell us you ask for nothing but to be let alone. We ask but the same. We do not seek to involve us, the non-slaveholders of the country, in the responsibility of upholding institutions condemned by our deepest political, moral, and religious convictions.

### SPAIN.

There is something mournful about the decay of a once mighty power. A fertile theme of meditation is afforded by the sight of a people whose very name was once emblematic of dignity and splendor, of power upon the land and upon the sea, sinking, by slow but hopeless, gradation, into a more melancholy memorial of departed greatness. Such is Spain at the present day, unless some happy revolution arrange for the better occur, it is evident that her "course of empire" will soon be fulfilled. Under the Moors, the population of Spain was estimated at 15,000,000. It now numbers only 50,000. Medina del Campo in the seventeenth century contained 60,000 inhabitants; it now contains 6,000. Merida at the epoch possessed 40,000 inhabitants; it now possesses 5,000.

From these expressions, and other tokens which daily greet us, it is evident that at least in the southern portion of the country is forlorn, and, under this sentiment, I rejoice to believe that the whole North will be quickened with the true life of freedom. Sir Philip Sidney, speaking of the Netherlands, in his spirited, which animated every man, woman, and child, in the Netherlands against the Spanish Power, declared that the spirit of the Lord, and is invincible." A similar spirit is now animating the free States against the Slave Power, breathing everywhere its precious inspiration, and forbidding a despair under the soul-sacred usurpation. The threat of disunion, so often sounded in our ears, will be disregarded by an aroused and indignant people. Ah, sir, Senators vainly expect peace. No! In this way can peace come. In passing this bill, you scatter, broadcast through the land, dragon's teeth, and, though they may not, in the modern fable, spring up armed men, yet will they fructify in civil strife and feud.

From the depths of my soul, as a loyal citizen and as a Senator, I plead, remonstrate, protest against the passage of this bill. I struggle against it, as against death; but, as in death there is resumption puts on incorruption and this mortal body puts on immortality, so from the sting of this hour I find assurances of that triumph by which Freedom will be restored to her immortal birthright in the Republic.

Sir, the bill, which you are now about to pass, is at once the worst and the best bill, on which Congress has ever acted.

It is the worst bill, inasmuch as it is a present victory of Slavery. In a Christian land and in the nineteenth century, the very standard of Freedom is struck down, opening the way to all the countless woes and wrongs of human bondage. Among the crimes of history a new bill must be noted. Hereafter, in all future days, will be read with universal shame. The Tea Tax and Stamp Act, which aroused the patriotism of our fathers, were trifles by the side of this enormity; nor would it be easy to imagine, at this day, any measure which more openly defied every sentiment of justice, humanity, and Christianity. Am I not right, then, in calling it the worst bill on which Congress ever acted?

But there is another side to which I gladly turn. Sir, it is the best bill on which Congress ever acted; for it prepares the way for that "All Hail Hereafter," when slavery must disappear. It annuls all past compromises with slavery, and makes all future compromises impossible. Thus it puts Freedom and Slavery face to face, and bids them grapple. Who can doubt the issue? Sir, I see in the gloom of the Future, when, at last, there will really be a North, and the slave power will be broken; when the tyranny of Slavocracy will cease to dominate over our Government, no longer a compressing itself upon all that it does, at home and abroad; when the National Government in regard to the country, forever, will be free and, according to the true intention of our fathers, freedom shall be established by Congress over all territory.

Slavery will then be driven from its usurped foothold, here in the District of Columbia; in the Territories, and on the high seas, wherever the national flag; the Fugitive Slave bill, as odious as it is unconstitutional, will become a dead letter; and the domestic slave trade, so far as it is carried on by the navy, and by the high-seas, will be blasted by Congressional prohibition. Every where, within the sphere of National influence, Freedom will be established, and the time hastened when, at last, there will really be a United States